

Appln. No.: 09/725,249  
Amendment dated June 8, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed February 8, 2006

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of February 8, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are Applicants' response thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1-19, 21-23 and 25-35 are pending. Claim 20 and 24 are cancelled. Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21-23 and 25-32 has been amended. Claim 35 is new. Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,849 to Hanson *et al.* (Hanson). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson. Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,271 to Mainwaring *et al.* (Mainwaring). Claims 7, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Mainwaring in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 to Maurille (Maurille). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Mainwaring and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,048 to Carau (Carau). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,460 to Patil (Patil). Claims 15, 17, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Maurille. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,129 to Dynarski *et al.* (Dynarski). Claims 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Maurille and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974 to Tognazzini (Tognazzini). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### **New Claim**

Claim 35 is new. Support for this claim is at least found on pg 9, lines 8-23, thus no new matter has been added.

#### **Amended Claims**

Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21-23 and 25-32 have been amended.

Appln. No.: 09/725,249  
Amendment dated June 8, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed February 8, 2006

Independent claims 1, 11, 16, 21 and 22 have been amended to recite a feature similar to the feature "a unique identification (ID), distinct from network addresses of said wireless devices," as recited in claim 1. Support for this is found in the claims as filed and in the specification as filed at pg. 6, ln. 18 – pg. 7, ln. 3, which explains that the terminals include a unique identification before they are switched on, whereas a network address requires the device to be already be switched on. Applicants note that while this meaning was inherent in the claims as filed, the Office Action's overly broad reading of the ID as being comparable to a network address has forced this additional clarification.

In addition, claims 1-12, 14-19, 21-23 and 25-32 have been amended to clarify and correct informalities such as antecedent basis for various terms and to ensure that the pending claims are not directed to both methods and apparatus at the same time. No new matter was added by these amendments.

**Rejection of the Claims – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) & § 103(a)**

Claims 1-19, 21-23 and 25-34 were rejected in view of Hanson, either under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) or § 103(a), along or in combination with additional references. The rejection of all these claims depends on the Office Action's position that Hanson discloses the unique identification as recited in the pending claims. In particular, the Office Action equates the use of an IP address that may be associated with a wireless terminal with the unique identification recited in each of the pending claims.

To clarify the intended scope of the claims, claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite "a unique identification (ID), distinct from network addresses of said wireless devices." Therefore, it is clear that the ID cannot be equated with the network address of the wireless devices. Applicants respectfully submit this amendment does not change the scope of the ID because this was the intent all along, as is made plain in the specification. Thus, this amendment is being made to prevent what Applicants feel is an unreasonably broad interpretation of the term ID as provided in the Office Action. The Office Action has failed to point to any portion of Hanson, or any of the other cited references, as discloses, suggesting or teaching a unique identification as recited. Accordingly, independent claim 1 includes at least one feature not

Appln. No.: 09/725,249  
Amendment dated June 8, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed February 8, 2006

disclosed, suggested or taught by the references of record and cannot be said to be anticipated or rendered unpatentable by the references of record, alone or in combination.

The remaining independent claims 11, 16, 21 and 22 include a feature similar to the feature of claim 1 that is discussed above and therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, are not anticipated or rendered unpatentable by the references of record, alone or in combination.

The remaining pending claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 23-34 depend from one of the independent claims and therefore is not anticipated or rendered unpatentable by the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features recited therein.


#### CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 8, 2006

By:

  
Charles L. Miller  
Registration No. 43,085

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
Ten South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Tel: (312) 463-5000  
Fax: (312) 463-5001